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#### Economic collapse is inevitable – the current globalized economy is unsustainable

Korowicz, 11

[Korowicz is a physicist and human systems ecologist, the director of The Risk/Resilience Network in Ireland, a board member of FEASTA - The Foundation for the Economics of Sustainability, “In the world, at the limits to growth,” May 14, 2011, http://www.feasta.org/2011/05/14/in-the-world-at-the-limits-to-growth/]

From the sidelines we hear that a UN Food and Agricultural Organisation index measuring the price of a basket of food commodities surpassed the 2008 record and oil prices remain well above $100 a barrel. This is in the context of a battered world economy and a global credit crisis that far from being resolved, has merely been displaced. The United States and Japan’s credit rating is on negative watch, and the Euro hangs in balance. And while nobody will shout about it, there are many global banks who are only standing because governments and central banks are deploying all their declining powers to prevent the banks’ bluff being called and all hell breaking lose. Food and energy prices are pushing popular revolutions in the Gulf, North Africa, and China which in turn are pushing up food and energy prices. All of this seems elliptical to our inward conversations.

Yet the real threats to our economy and society over the coming few years are from these things we have little control over. Even were our economy in the rudest of health, it could still face ruin. That is because we are dependent upon, and interwoven with, the globalised economy. And the globalised economy cannot stand the convergence in real time of constraints in its primary enabling energy resource-oil; its primary human constraint-food, and loss of trust in the credit that makes economic life possible. This convergence marks the end of economic growth, and initiates powerful destabilising shocks and stresses to the globalised economy.

Because of this, across the political spectrum, people are claiming solutions for a predicament that cannot be solved. They are claiming a level of insight and dominion over systems they can barely intuit and over which they have little and declining control. The electorate assumes there must be a solution to get us out of recession, a way to reverse what we have come to call ‘austerity’. More than that, we demand the right to the realisation of their expectations- our pensions and purchasing power, jobs and savings, health and education services.

#### Growth kills the environment

Barry, 08

[Dr. Glen Barry, President and Founder of Ecological Internet, an online portal for the global environmental movement, Ph.D. in Land Resources from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, M.S. in Conservation Biology and Sustainable Development from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and B.A. in Political Science from Marquette University, 2008, “Economic Collapse And Global Ecology,” Earth Meanders, January 14th, Available Online at http://www.countercurrents.org/barry140108.htm]

**H**umanity and the Earth are faced with an enormous conundrum -- sufficient climate policies enjoy political support only in times of rapid economic growth. Yet this growth is the primary factor driving greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental ills. The growth machine has pushed the planet well beyond its ecological carrying capacity, and unless constrained, can only lead to human extinction and an end to complex life.

With every economic downturn, like the one now looming in the United States, it becomes more difficult and less likely that policy sufficient to ensure global ecological sustainability will be embraced. This essay explores the possibility that from a biocentric viewpoint of needs for long-term global ecological, economic and social sustainability; it would be better for the economic collapse to come now rather than later.

Economic growth is a deadly disease upon the Earth, with capitalism as its most virulent strain. Throw-away consumption and explosive population growth are made possible by using up fossil fuels and destroying ecosystems. Holiday shopping numbers are covered by media in the same breath as Arctic ice melt, ignoring their deep connection. Exponential economic growth destroys ecosystems and pushes the biosphere closer to failure.

#### That causes extinction

Diner in ’94 [David Dinner, Ph. D in Planetary Science and Geology. “The Army and the Endangered Speciies Act: Who’s Endangering Who?. Military Law Review 143. 1994]

To accept that the snail darter, harelip sucker, or Dismal Swamp southeastern shrew 74 could save [hu]mankind may be difficult for some. Many, if not most, species are useless to[hu]man[s] in a direct utilitarian sense. Nonetheless, they may be critical in an indirect role, because their extirpations could affect a directly useful species negatively. In a closely interconnected ecosystem, the loss of a species affects other species dependent on it. 75 Moreover, as the number of species decline, the effect of each new extinction on the remaining species increases dramatically. 4. Biological Diversity. -- The main premise of species preservation is that diversity is better than simplicity. 77 As the current mass extinction has progressed, the world's biological diversity generally has decreased. This trend occurs within ecosystems by reducing the number of species, and within species by reducing the number of individuals. Both trends carry serious future implications. 78 [\*173] Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist a stress. . . . [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." 79 By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction**,** with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction**.** Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, 80 [hu]mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

#### Collapse now is key to a mindset shift – the alternative is guaranteed extinction

Barry, 08

[Dr. Glen Barry, President and Founder of Ecological Internet, an online portal for the global environmental movement, Ph.D. in Land Resources from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, M.S. in Conservation Biology and Sustainable Development from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and B.A. in Political Science from Marquette University, 2008, “Economic Collapse And Global Ecology,” Earth Meanders, January 14th, Available Online at http://www.countercurrents.org/barry140108.htm]

Perpetual economic growth, and necessary climate and other ecological policies, are fundamentally incompatible. Global ecological sustainability depends critically upon establishing a steady state economy, whereby production is right-sized to not diminish natural capital. Whole industries like coal and natural forest logging will be eliminated even as new opportunities emerge in solar energy and environmental restoration.

This critical transition to both economic and ecological sustainability is simply not happening on any scale. The challenge is how to carry out necessary environmental policies even as economic growth ends and consumption plunges. The natural response is going to be liquidation of even more life-giving ecosystems, and jettisoning of climate policies, to vainly try to maintain high growth and personal consumption.

We know that humanity must reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% over coming decades. How will this and other necessary climate mitigation strategies be maintained during years of economic downturns, resource wars, reasonable demands for equitable consumption, and frankly, the weather being more pleasant in some places? If efforts to reduce emissions and move to a steady state economy fail; the collapse of ecological, economic and social systems is assured.

Bright greens take the continued existence of a habitable Earth with viable, sustainable populations of all species including humans as the ultimate truth and the meaning of life. Whether this is possible in a time of economic collapse is crucially dependent upon whether enough ecosystems and resources remain post collapse to allow humanity to recover and reconstitute sustainable, relocalized societies.

It may be better for the Earth and humanity's future that economic collapse comes sooner rather than later, while more ecosystems and opportunities to return to nature's fold exist. Economic collapse will be deeply wrenching -- part Great Depression, part African famine. There will be starvation and civil strife, and a long period of suffering and turmoil.

Many will be killed as balance returns to the Earth. Most people have forgotten how to grow food and that their identity is more than what they own. Yet there is some justice, in that those who have lived most lightly upon the land will have an easier time of it, even as those super-consumers living in massive cities finally learn where their food comes from and that ecology is the meaning of life. Economic collapse now means humanity and the Earth ultimately survive to prosper again.

Human suffering -- already the norm for many, but hitting the currently materially affluent -- is inevitable given the degree to which the planet's carrying capacity has been exceeded. We are a couple decades at most away from societal strife of a much greater magnitude as the Earth's biosphere fails. Humanity can take the bitter medicine now, and recover while emerging better for it; or our total collapse can be a final, fatal death swoon.

A successful revolutionary response to imminent global ecosystem collapse would focus upon bringing down the Earth's industrial economy now. As society continues to fail miserably to implement necessary changes to allow creation to continue, maybe the best strategy to achieve global ecological sustainability is economic sabotage to hasten the day. It is more fragile than it looks.

Humanity is a marvelous creation. Yet her current dilemma is unprecedented. It is not yet known whether she is able to adapt, at some expense to her comfort and short-term well-being, to ensure survival. If she can, all futures of economic, social and ecological collapse can be avoided. If not it is better from a long-term biocentric viewpoint that the economic growth machine collapse now, bringing forth the necessary change, and offering hope for a planetary and human revival.

#### Economic decline does not breed war – studies prove

Miller, 2k (Morris, economist, adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration, consultant on international development issues, former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank, Winter, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol. 25, Iss. 4, “Poverty as a cause of wars?” p. Proquest)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

## \*\*\* Uniqueness

### Growth Unsustainable

#### Growth is unsustainable- transitioning now is key

Assadourian 12 MOVI NG TOWAR D S U STAI NAB LE P ROS PER ITY THE WORLDWATCH INSTITUTE Erik Assadourian State of the World 2012 http://blogs.worldwatch.org/sustainableprosperity/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/SOW12\_chap\_2.pdf

Ultimately, overdeveloped countries (and overdeveloped populations within developing countries) will need to either proactively pursue a degrowth path or continue down the broken path of growth until coasts flood, farmlands dry up, and other massive ecological changes force them away from growth into a mad dash for societal survival. If overdeveloped populations keep ignoring the looming changes—keeping their proverbial heads buried in the sand—then this transition will be brutal and painful. But if a strategy of degrowth, economic diversification, and support for the informal economy is pursued now, before most of societal energy and capital is focused on reacting to ecological shifts, these overdeveloped populations may discover a series of benefits to their own welfare, to their long-term security, and to Earth’s well-being. It is no surprise that overdeveloped countries also suffer from a series of ailments connected to overconsumption—since affluence and development decoupled long ago for many in these countries. The clearest indicator is the obesity epidemic now plaguing most industrial countries and developing-world elites. In the United States, two of every three adults are now overweight or obese, reducing their quality of life, shortening life spans, and costing the country an extra $270 billion a year in medical costs and lost productivity due to early deaths and disabilities. This epidemic may even lead to the next generation living fewer years than their parents did, primarily due to obesityrelated problems like heart disease, diabetes, and certain cancers. Tragic statistics, but there are many who prosper from this type of growth: agribusiness, processed-food manufacturers, marketers, hospitals, pharmaceutical companies, and others all profit from maintaining the status quo. The diet industry alone earns up to $100 billion a year on obesity in the United States. And the United States is not exceptional on this front, merely a trendsetter. In 2010, 1.9 billion people were overweight or obese worldwide, up 38 percent over 2002, even though total population rose 11 percent in that time. 8 Obesity, unfortunately, is not the only side effect of overdevelopment. Increased debt burdens, long working hours, pharmaceutical dependence, time trapped in traffic, even increased levels of social isolation stem at least in part from high-consumption lifestyles. Indeed, while many modern advances—personal transport, single-family homes, televisions, computers, and electronic gadgets—seem to have improved human well-being, in reality these advances may have imposed significant sacrifices on consumer populations without their knowledge or consent. 9 More broadly, along with reducing the physical and societal side effects of the obsessive pursuit of growth, pursuing degrowth would reduce the ecological impacts of the human economy, as some populations would consume less food, resources, and energy. Perhaps the most important but least tangible outcome of this would be to reduce the loss of Earth’s resiliency, which humanity and all species depend on completely for their ability to survive and thrive. Of course, it is simple to advocate for the sanity of degrowing the ecologically destructive global economy. But when growth is one of the fundamental sacred myths of modern culture, and when economists, the media, and political leaders routinely wring their hands whenever the economy contracts, shifting paradigms 180 degrees will be extremely difficult. Instead, degrowth will need to be pursued very strategically—working simultaneously on a variety of complementary fronts.

#### Growth is unsustainable – nine warrants

Simms and Johnson 10 – (Andrew Simms, policy director and head of climate change and energy at the New Economics Foundation, and a participating member of Oxfam and the International Institute for Environment and Development as well as a regular contributor to the International Red Cross’s annual World Disasters Report, and Victoria Johnson, PhD in Atmospheric Physics, Imperial College of London, climate change and energy program researcher at the New Economics Foundation, January 2010, “Growth isn’t possible: Why we need a new economic direction,” New Economics Foundation,[http://www.neweconomics.org/publications/growth-isnt-possible](http://www.neweconomics.org/publications/growth-isnt-possible%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank))

This report focuses mainly on how the need to preserve a climate system that is conducive to human society puts a limit on orthodox economic growth. But climate change is not the only natural parameter. Other limits of our biocapacity also need respecting if we are to maintain humanity’s environmental life support system. Two important areas of research, described below, provide examples of attempts to define some of those limits and raise questions for economists and policy makers. The Ecological Footprint 25 From a methodology first developed by the Canadian geographer William Rees in the early 1980s, the ecological footprint is now a well-established technique being constantly refined as available data and understanding of ecosystems improves. It compares the biocapacity available to provide, for example, farmland, fisheries and forestry, as well as to absorb waste from human economic activity, with the rate at which humanity consumes those resources and produces waste, for example in the form of greenhouse gas emissions. The 2009 set of Global Footprint Accounts reveal that the human population is demanding nature’s services, using resources and generating CO 2 emissions, at a rate that is 44 per cent faster than what nature can replace and reabsorb. That means it takes the Earth just under 18 months to produce the ecological services humanity needs in one year. Very conservatively, for the whole world to consume and produce waste at the level of an average person in the United Kingdom, we would need the equivalent of at least 3.4 planets like earth. Most worryingly there are signs that available biocapacity is actually reducing, being worn out, by current levels of overuse, setting up a negative spiral of overconsumption and weakening capacity to provide. Planetary boundaries A much more recent approach, published in science journal Nature in September 2009, uses the notion of ‘planetary boundaries.’ 26 The work, coauthored by 29 leading international scientists, identifies nine processes in the biosphere for which the researchers considered it necessary to ‘define planetary boundaries’. They are: climate change; rate of biodiversity loss (terrestrial and marine); interference with the nitrogen and phosphorus cycles; stratospheric ozone depletion; ocean acidification; global freshwater use; change in land use; chemical pollution; and atmospheric aerosol loading Of these nine, the authors found that three boundaries had already been transgressed: climate change, interference with the nitrogen cycle, and biodiversity loss (see Table 1). Setting boundaries is complex. Earth systems change and react in often non-linear ways. The erosion or overburdening of one system can affect the behaviour and resilience of another. As the research points out, ‘If one boundary is transgressed, then other boundaries are also under serious risk. For instance, significant land-use changes in the Amazon could influence water resources as far away as Tibet.’ Nevertheless, and even though with caveats, the authors identify boundaries for seven of the nine processes leaving the safe threshholds for atmospheric aerosol loading and chemical pollution still ‘to be identified.’ The work on planetary boundaries complements (although unusually doesn’t reference) the ecological footprint method. The latter, due to a lack of previous research on safe rates of harvest and waste dumping, merely produces a best assessment of full available biocapacity and compares it to human rates of consumption and waste generation. This conservatively, or rather generously, creates the impression that all biocapacity might be available for human use. The attempt to define more nuanced planetary boundaries concerning different earth systems, is set to produce more realistic, and almost inevitably smaller assessments of the share of the earth’s resources and services available for safe human economic use.

#### Economic growth is unsustainable-- resource depletion, consumption levels, and environmental destruction make collapse inevitable

Trainer 7 — Ted Trainer, Visiting Fellow in the Faculty of Arts at the University of New South Wales, 2007 (“We can't go on living like this,” *On Line Opinion* - Australia's e-journal of social and political debate, April 20th, Available Online at http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/view.asp? article=5754, Accessed 07-15-2008)

We say we want to save the environment, and to have peace, and to eliminate poverty. And we do - but only until we see what this requires.

The fundamental cause of the big global problems threatening us now is simply over-consumption. The rate at which we in rich countries are using up resources is grossly unsustainable. It’s far beyond levels that can be kept up for long or that could be spread to all people. Yet most people totally fail to grasp the magnitude of the over-shoot.

The reductions required are so big that they cannot be achieved within a consumer-capitalist society. Huge and extremely radical change to very systems and culture are necessary.

Several lines of argument lead to this conclusion, but I’ll note only three.

Some resources are already alarmingly scarce, including water, land, fish and especially petroleum. Some geologists think petroleum supply will peak within a decade. If all the world’s people today were to consume resources at the per capita rate we in rich countries do, the annual supply rate would have to be more than six times as great as at present, and if the population of 9 billion we will have on earth soon were to do so it would have to be about ten times as great.

Second, the per capita area of productive land needed to supply one Australian with food, water, settlements and energy, is about 7-8 ha. The US figure is closer to 12 ha. But the average per capita area of productive land available on the planet is only about 1.3 ha. When the world population reaches 9 billion the per capita area of productive land available will be only 0.8 ha. In other words in a world where resources were shared equally we would all have to get by on about 10 per cent of the present average Australian footprint.

Third, the greenhouse problem is the most powerful and alarming illustration of the overshoot. The scientists are telling us that if we are to stop the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere from reaching twice the pre-industrial level we must cut global carbon emissions, and thus fossil fuel use, by 60 per cent in the short term, and more later.

If we cut it 60 per cent and shared the remaining energy among 9 billion people each Australian would have to get by on less than 5 per cent of the fossil fuel now used. And that target, a doubling of atmospheric CO2, is much too high to be safe. We’re now 30 per cent above pre-industrial levels and already seeing disturbing climatic effects.

These lines of argument show we must face up to enormous reductions in rich world resource use, perhaps by 90 per cent, if we’re to solve the big global problems. This is not possible in a society that’s committed to the affluent lifestyles that require high energy and resource use.

Now all that only makes clear that the present situation is grossly unsustainable. But this society is fundamentally and fiercely obsessed with raising levels of production and consumption all the time, as fast as possible, and without any limit. In other words our supreme, sacred, never-questioned goal is economic growth. We’re already at impossible levels of production and consumption but our top priority is to go on increasing them all the time.

#### Growth is unsustainable – studies prove

Gowdy 98 — John M. Gowdy, Professor of Economics at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 1998 (“Biophysical Limits to Industrialization: Prospects for the Twenty-first Century," *The Coming Age of Scarcity: Preventing Mass Death and Genocide in the Twenty-first Century*, edited by Michael N. Dobkowski and Isidor Wallimann, Published by Syracuse University Press, ISBN 0815627440, p. 65-66)

Among physical scientists, and among biologists and ecologists in particular, the view is widely held that the current level of human activity is unsustainable. Various biophysical indicators suggest that our species is pushing the limits of the ability of the planet to support us. According to calculations by Vitousek and others (1986), human activity, directly and indirectly, expropriates about 40 percent of the potential terrestrial products of photosynthesis. Exhaustive calculations by Kraushaar and Ristinen (1993), based on solar energy flow, conversion efficiencies, and many other factors, estimate that the planet has enough arable land to support a population of 10 billion. The human population is now approaching 6 billion and still growing rapidly. Economic activity, particularly burning fossil fuels and the destruction of forests, [end page 65] has pushed atmospheric CO2 to the highest levels since a period of global warming some 125,000 years ago. Atmospheric CO2 is expected to increase from its preindustrial level of 270 ppm to 600 ppm by the middle of the twenty-first century raising global temperatures by 350 to 7°C and raising sea levels by 1 to 2 meters by thermal expansion alone (Manabe and Stouffer 1993). Even if there are no surprises, such as a sudden climate flip from one steady sate to another, the rise in temperature caused by higher atmospheric CO2 levels will have serious consequences for the ability of the human population to feed itself. In the view of many biologists, the most serious environmental problem is biodiversity loss. According to F. 0. Wilson (1992) the current catastrophic loss of biodiversity represents the sixth major extinction of life on earth that has occurred during the 570-million-year history of complex life on the planet. He estimates that by the middle of the next century more than 20 percent of existing species will disappear.

Each of the above calculations and observations may be disputed. The likelihood, however, that they are all fundamentally wrong is virtually zero. From many different perspectives it is clear that we are pushing the limits of the ability of the biophysical world to support the continued expansion of the use of natural resources and of the assimilative capacity of the environment. Evidence from many sources leads us to the conclusion that industrial production will be drastically reduced because of constraints on energy and resource use arising from supply constraints and environmental limits. It is increasingly likely that sometime in the next century the “industrialization project” (Wallimann 1994) will come to a halt with unforeseen but probably negative consequences for our species. What are the prospects for getting off the industrial growth path before social disintegration and mass death is inevitable?

#### Consumption not sustainable- multiple constraining factors

Worldwatch 10 Science, Environment 2010 State of the World http://blogs.worldwatch.org/transformingcultures/wp-content/uploads/2009/04/Chapter-1.pdf

The Unsustainability of Current Consumption Patterns In 2006, people around the world spent $30.5 trillion on goods and services (in 2008 dollars). These expenditures included basic necessities like food and shelter, but as discretionary incomes rose, people spent more on consumer goods—from richer foods and larger homes to televisions, cars, computers, and air travel. In 2008 alone, people around the world purchased 68 million vehicles, 85 million refrigerators, 297 million computers, and 1.2 billion mobile (cell) phones. 2 Consumption has grown dramatically over the past five decades, up 28 percent from the $23.9 trillion spent in 1996 and up sixfold from the $4.9 trillion spent in 1960 (in 2008 dollars). Some of this increase comes from the growth in population, but human numbers only grew by a factor of 2.2 between 1960 and 2006. Thus consumption expenditures per person still almost tripled. 3 As consumption has risen, more fossil fuels, minerals, and metals have been mined from the earth, more trees have been cut down, and more land has been plowed to grow food (often to feed livestock as people at higher income levels started to eat more meat). Between 1950 and 2005, for example, metals production grew sixfold, oil consumption eightfold, and natural gas consumption 14fold. In total, 60 billion tons of resources are now extracted annually—about 50 percent more than just 30 years ago. Today, the average European uses 43 kilograms of resources daily, and the average American uses 88 kilograms. All in all, the world extracts the equivalent of 112 Empire State Buildings from the earth every single day. 4 The exploitation of these resources to maintain ever higher levels of consumption has put increasing pressure on Earth’s systems and in the process has dramatically disrupted the ecological systems on which humanity and countless other species depend. The Ecological Footprint Indicator, which compares humanity’s ecological impact with the amount of productive land and sea area available to supply key ecosystem services, shows that humanity now uses the resources and services of 1.3 Earths. (See Figure 1.) In other words, people are using about a third more of Earth’s capacity than is available, undermining the resilience of the very ecosystems on which humanity depends. 5 In 2005 the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA), a comprehensive review of scientific research that involved 1,360 experts from 95 countries, reinforced these findings. It found that some 60 percent of ecosystem services— climate regulation, the provision of fresh water, waste treatment, food from fisheries, and many other services—were being degraded or used unsustainably. The findings were so unsettling that the MA Board warned that “human activity is putting such strain on the natural functions of Earth that the ability of the planet’s ecosystems to sustain future generations can no longer be taken for granted.” 6

###  [ ] AT: Tech solves

#### Modern industrial society is fundamentally unsustainable—technology can’t solve.

Milbrath 3 — Lester W. Milbrath, Director Emeritus of the Research Program in Environment and Society at the State University of New York at Buffalo, 2003 (“Envisioning a Sustainable Society,” *Explorations in Environmental Political Theory: Thinking About What We Value*, edited by Joel Jay Kassiola, Published by M.E. Sharpe, ISBN 0765610523, p. 40-41)

If we persist on our current trajectory, we can expect, as already mentioned, that we will double human population within fifty years. We will triple or quadruple world economic output. That will lead to swift depletion of the world’s resources and to the emission of such a torrent of pollutants that the planet’s ecosystems cannot assimilate them. Most seriously, we are likely to change the pattern of the planet’s biogeochemical systems with all of the terrible consequences that I already have mentioned. We are likely to seek technological solutions to those problems, but it is my considered opinion that trying to solve societal problems with more and better technology will fail. We will belatedly and painfully learn that most socioeconomic problems are not amenable to a technological fix, and, moreover, that the environmental crisis is not a technological problem but is based on our values (see introduction to this volume).

Not only has modern industrial society created this crisis, but in my judgment, it is not capable of producing a solution. It is blinded to the existence of the crisis and disabled in trying to avoid it by the values it pursues. Think of the values upheld as good in contemporary political discourse: economic growth, consumption, efficiency, productivity, jobs, competitiveness, taking risks, power, winning. Societies pursuing those goals cannot avoid depleting their resources, cannot avoid degrading nature, cannot avoid poisoning life with wastes, and cannot avoid upsetting biospheric systems. Will we thoughtfully transform our society to a sustainable mode, or will we stubbornly refuse to change and have change forced upon us by the [end page 40] collapse of society’s fundamental underpinnings? Resisting change will make us victims of change. I repeat for emphasis, resisting change will make us victims of change.

#### New technology cannot create energy – can’t solve long-term economic downfalls

Simms and Johnson, 01/2010 – (Andrew Simms, policy director and head of climate change and energy at the New Economics Foundation, and a participating member of Oxfam and the International Institute for Environment and Development as well as a regular contributor to the International Red Cross’s annual World Disasters Report, and Victoria Johnson, PhD in Atmospheric Physics, Imperial College of London, climate change and energy program researcher at the New Economics Foundation, “Growth isn’t possible: Why we need a new economic direction,” New Economics Foundation, Available online at [http://www.neweconomics.org/publications/growth-isnt-possible](http://www.neweconomics.org/publications/growth-isnt-possible%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank), Accessed 07/29/2012, ZR)

There are numerous reasons for a rapid transition to a global energy system based on renewable technologies: wind, water and solar. As described throughout this report, these include climate change, energy security in the face of Peak Oil, cost-effective conversion and flexible and secure supply. Several studies have shown that, although not without a few difficulties to overcome, it is both practical and possible to meet the global demand for energy from these sources. 374 One recent study published in Scientific American in late 2009 outlined a plan to achieve just this – the complete decarbonisation of the global energy system – by the year 2030. 375 Based only on existing technology that can already be applied on a large 111 scale, it called for the building of 3.8 million large wind turbines, 90,000 solar plants and a combination of geothermal, tidal and rooftop solar-PV installations globally. The authors point out that while this is undeniably a bold scheme, the world already produces 73 million cars and light trucks every year. And, for comparison, starting in 1956 the US Interstate Highway System managed to build 47,000 miles of highway in just over three decades, ‘changing commerce and society’. But, even plentiful supplies of renewable energy are not a ‘get out of jail free’ card for economic growth. The reasons are few and straightforward. First, growth has a natural resource footprint that goes far beyond energy and we have to learn to live within the waste-absorbing and regenerative capacity of the whole biosphere. Secondly, even under the most ambitious programme of substituting new renewable energy for old fossil fuel systems, it will take time and, in climate terms, we are, according at least to James Hansen, already beyond safe limits of greenhouse gas concentrations. 376 More global growth will take us even further beyond, with few guarantees that in the space of a few short years the chances of avoiding runaway climate change become unacceptably small. Thirdly, we also have to take into account the fact that, at least until renewable energy achieves a scale whereby its own generated energy becomes self-reproducing in terms of the energy needed for manufacture, even renewable energy systems have a resource footprint to account for. For example, recent research by the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research suggests that embodied energy in new energy infrastructure means that it would be approximately eight years before a decarbonisation plan would have a meaningful impact on emissions. 377 Renewable technologies are rightly regarded as a potential source of future employment and have a large economic contribution to make, and tend to be seen as carbon neutral or potentially negative. 378 Despite this, their overall environmental impact is not entirely benign, and this is particularly evident when renewable technologies are considered on a large-scale, something that is regularly assumed in future emission/ economic growth scenarios. Renewable energy supply is still constrained by the laws of thermodynamics, since energy is being removed from a system; the natural system of the Earth. Whilst this refers to the theoretical limits of energy from renewable sources, there are also practical limits; for example, ‘…large enough interventions in [these] natural energy flows and stocks can have immediate and adverse effects on environmental services essential to human well-being’. 379 This is most obviously the case where biomass (e.g. biofuels) are concerned. It has been suggested that given that 30–40 per cent of the How much can energy efficiency really improve? Growth isn’t possible 112 terrestrial primary productivity is already appropriated by humans; any major increase could cause the collapse of critical ecosystems. 380 In the IEA AP scenario, it is assumed that biofuels, such as biodiesel and bioethanol will replace mineral oil for use in transport. Without encouraging more land-use change, a major anthropogenic contributor to CO 2 emissions, relying on energy biomass to provide a natural replacement to gasoline (petrol) would mean competition of agricultural land for food and fuel. Yet, with increasing population and increasing energy requirements is this physically possible without causing widespread ecosystem collapse? This is one of the key reasons why Jacobsen and Delucchi, authors of the study published in Scientific American, do not rely on biofuels in their plan. 381

### Econ Collapse Inevitable

#### Economic collapse is inevitable – growth can only delay the collapse of modern industrial civilization, not prevent it.

Lewis 98 — Chris H. Lewis, Instructor in the Sewall American Studies Program at the University of Colorado, 1998 (“The Paradox of Global Development and the Necessary Collapse of Modern Industrial Civilization,” *The Coming Age of Scarcity: Preventing Mass Death and Genocide in the Twenty-first Century*, edited by Michael N. Dobkowski and Isidor Wallimann, Published by Syracuse University Press, ISBN 0815627440, p. 45-46)

Thus, the rapid expansion of modern industrial civilization since the 1600s, which modern peoples understand as progress, is destroying the earth and threatening the human future (Hauchier and Kennedy 1994). Since the birth of the modern world, we have witnessed accelerating global population growth, air and water pollution, destruction of forests, farmland, and fisheries, depletion of nonrenewable natural resources, loss of biodiversity, and increasing poverty and misery throughout the nonmodern world (Brown and Kane 1994). In Worldwatch’s State of the World 1995, Hilary French (1995, 171) concludes: “The relentless pace of global ecological decline shows no signs of letting up. Carbon dioxide concentrations are mounting in the atmosphere, species loss continues to accelerate, fisheries are collapsing, land degradation frustrates efforts to feed hungry people, and the earth’s forest cover keeps shrinking.” And in his introduction to State of the World 1995, Lester Brown (1995) warns that eroding soils, shrinking forests, deteriorating rangelands, expanding deserts, acid rain, stratospheric ozone depletion, the buildup of greenhouse gases, air pollution, and the loss of biological diversity threatens global food production and future economic growth. How could this rapid growth in wealth, population, science and technology, and human control over the natural world have produced such catastrophic results?

Progress is proving to be a dangerous delusion, which modern peoples continue to support despite the overwhelming evidence that it has led to an escalating war against the earth. Ironically, the modern world’s relentless pursuit of victory in this centuries-old war against nature will be the principal cause of its defeat and collapse. In The Vanishing White Man, Stan Steiner (1976, 277) argued: The ruins of the Roman Empire, and the Mayan and Byzantine and Ottoman and Inca and Islamic and Egyptian and Ghanaian and Nigerian and Spanish and Aztec and English and Grecian and Persian, and the Mongolian civilization of the great Khans are visible for all to see. Is it heresy to say that the civilization of the white man of Western Europe, which has dominated much of the earth for four hundred years, is about to become one more magnificent ruin? Not because it has failed to accomplish its goals, but because it has succeeded so well, its time on earth may be done. The paradox of development is that the tremendous success of modern industrial civilization will be the cause of its [end page 45] collapse and ruin. To understand this paradox, we need to understand how modern economic and political institutions are creating both the so-called developed and underdeveloped worlds, which I will refer to as the First and Third worlds (Escobar 1995).

#### Drive for growth is unsustainable and collapses the environment

James Gustave **Speth ‘11**

Speth is a professor at Vermont Law School and a Distinguished Senior Fellow at Demos, a nonpartisan public policy research and advocacy organization. A former dean of the Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies, he also co-founded the Natural Resources Defense Council, was founder and president of the World Resources Institute, and served as administrator of the United Nations Development Programme.“Creating A New Vision Of Economic Growth” 6/1, http://www.countercurrents.org/speth010611.htm

But an expanding body of evidence is now telling us to think again. The never-ending drive to grow the overall U.S. economy is ruining the environment; it fuels a ruthless international search for energy and other resources; it fails at generating the needed jobs; it hollows out communities; and it rests on a manufactured consumerism that is not meeting the deepest human needs. Americans are substituting growth and consumption for dealing with the real issues — for doing things that would truly make us and the country better off.

It is time for America to move to post-growth society where the natural environment, working life, our communities and families, and the public sector are no longer sacrificed for the sake of mere GDP growth; where the illusory promises of ever-more growth no longer provide an excuse for neglecting to deal generously with our country’s compelling social needs; and where true citizen democracy is no longer held hostage to the growth imperative.

### Overpopulation Inevitable

#### Economic growth can’t sustain population growth

**Brent ‘11** – frequent contributor to Countercurrents, expert on population issues

(Jason, “Cessation of Growth: Voluntary and Coercive Population Control,” 7/18, http://www.countercurrents.org/brent180711.htm)

1. The Earth is finite in size.

2. Population and economic growth must cease. Infinite population and/or economic growth cannot occur on the finite Earth.

3. Both population and the economy grow in a compound/exponential manner.

4. Compound/exponential growth is the most powerful force in the universe, it overwhelms everything.

5. If anything were to grow at the compound growth rate of one percent per year it would double in about 70 years; increase by a factor of four in 140 years; a factor of eight in 210 years and a factor of 1,000 (actually 1,024) in 700 years. If growth were to continue at the same compound rate for an additional 700 years, total of 1,400 years, it would increase by a factor of 1 million and if growth continued at the same rate for a total of 2,100 years the factor would be 1 billion. At the extremely small rate of growth of one quarter of one percent (0.0025) it would take about 2,800 years, less time than from the construction of the pyramids until today, for either the economy or the population to grow by a factor of greater than 1,000. And 2,800 years is almost an infinitely small period of time when compared to the 160 million years that the dinosaurs ruled the earth.

6. Since compound/exponential growth is so powerful, both the economy and the population of the world must cease their growth in the very near future. I can state with almost absolute certainty that if either were to grow at the compound rate of one percent per year growth will cease no later than 140 years from today as such a growth rate would cause both of them to increase by a factor of four and the Earth could not support a population four times as great as the present population or a world economy four times as great as the current world economy.

7. The resources used by humanity can be divided into two groups, nonrenewable and renewable. By definition nonrenewable resources are finite and will eventually be used up by humanity. Many, if not most, renewable resources are being used up by humanity faster than nature can replace them and, therefore, they also must be considered nonrenewable.

8. Recycling, substitution of one resource for another resource, new technologies, environmentalism, and any other action taken by humanity will not permit continuous compound economic and/or population growth. Alternative energy resources will not permit continuous compound population and/or economic growth. Humanity has withdrawn from the Earth the most easily accessible resources which the Earth can provide. In the future resources will become more expensive and difficult to obtain as they will be substantially less accessible and will be more difficult to process into usable a form.

9. The concept of obtaining resources from extraterrestrial planets or transferring part of humanity to extraterrestrial planets is a non-workable fallacy.

### Transition Solves

#### Transition is our only hope for survival—their impacts pale in comparison.

Lewis 98 — Chris H. Lewis, Instructor in the Sewall American Studies Program at the University of Colorado, 1998 (“The Paradox of Global Development and the Necessary Collapse of Modern Industrial Civilization," *The Coming Age of Scarcity: Preventing Mass Death and Genocide in the Twenty-first Century*, edited by Michael N. Dobkowski and Isidor Wallimann, Published by Syracuse University Press, ISBN 0815627440, p. 58-60)

The only alternative we now have is to recognize the very real imminent collapse of global industrial civilization. Instead of seeing this collapse as a tragedy, and trying to put Humpty Dumpty back together again, we must see it as a real opportunity to solve some of the basic economic, political, and social problems created and exacerbated by the development of modern industrial civilization. Instead of insisting on coordinated global actions, we should encourage self-sufficiency through the creation of local and regional economies and trading networks (Norgaard 1994). We must help political and economic leaders understand that the more their countries are tied to the global economic system, the more risk there is of serious economic and political collapse.

In the case of the collapse of Mayan civilization, the city-states and regions in Central America that were not as dependent on the central [end page 58] Mayan civilization, economy, and trade were more likely to survive its collapse. The city-states that were heavily dependent on Mayan hegemony destroyed themselves by fighting bitter wars with other powerful city-states to maintain their declining economic and political dominance (Weatherford 1994). Like the collapse of Mayan and Roman civilization, the collapse of global civilization will cause mass death and suffering as a result of the turmoil created by economic and political collapse. The more dependent nations are on the global economy, the more economic, political, and social chaos they will experience when it breaks down.

Once global civilization collapses, humanity will not have the material, biological, and energy resources to rebuild it. This must be the real lesson that nations and polities learn from this global collapse. If they try to rebuild unsustainable regional or even international economies, it will only cause more suffering and mass death.

In conclusion, the only solution to the growing political and economic chaos caused by the collapse of global industrial civilization is to encourage the uncoupling of nations and regions from the global economy. Efforts to integrate the underdeveloped countries with this global economy through sustainable development programs such as Agenda 21 will only further undermine the global economy and industrial civilization.

Unfortunately, millions will die in the wars and economic and political conflicts created by the accelerating collapse of global civilization. But we can be assured, on the basis of the past history of the collapse of regional civilizations such as the Mayan and the Roman empires, that, barring global nuclear war, human societies and civilizations will continue to exist and develop on a smaller, regional scale. Yes, such civilizations will be violent, corrupt, and often cruel, but, in the end, less so than our current global industrial civilization, which is abusing the entire planet and threatening the mass death and suffering of all its peoples and the living, biological fabric of life on earth.

The paradox of global economic development is that although it creates massive wealth and power for modern elites, it also creates massive poverty and suffering for underdeveloped peoples and societies. The failure of global development to end this suffering and destruction will bring about its collapse. This collapse will cause millions of people to suffer and die throughout the world, but it should, paradoxically, ensure the survival of future human societies. The collapse of global civilization is necessary for the future, long-term survival of human [end page 59] beings. Although this future seems hopeless and heartless, it is not. We can learn much from our present global crisis. What we learn will shape our future and the future of the complex, interconnected web of life on earth.

#### Transition is feasible

Schneidera et al 10 François Schneidera, Giorgos Kallisa, Joan Martinez-Aliera

Crisis or opportunity? Economic degrowth for social equity and ecological sustainability. Introduction to this special issue Accepted 13 January 2010. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652610000259

In conclusion, the current crisis is a threat in that it provides a justification for even “more of the same” even if under a green disguise. It offers however also an opportunity in that it shows the limits of economicism, it allows us to expose “growth fetishism” (Hamilton in this issue) as the root of the problem, and opens up some space for green policies (such as investments in renewable energies) which even though they can never realize green growth, they can definitely contribute to a smooth sustainable degrowth. Crises also open opportunities for alternative discourses. Elaborating and disseminating an alternative discourse is the objective of the Second International Conference on Degrowth in Barcelona (26–29 March 2010), which will receive even more participants and contributions than the first, as the degrowth community is increasing in numbers. Much of the conference will be devoted to working group discussions around practical policy proposals to take us out of the multiple crises we are facing. Our call for degrowth is a hopeful, even a utopian discourse. Should we prefer a business-as-usual without possible future or work towards a degrowth “utopia”? We must at least separate possible from impossible futures and look for an alternative to an optimistic “business-as-usual”. We cannot count on dematerialization after 20 years of limited progress in relative terms and no progress at all in absolute terms. An extension of the institutions of the market economy (through cap and trade systems for carbon dioxide) that facilitate further emissions is not a solution either. To avoid fear-mongering discourses and the danger of authoritarianism in the face of real crises, we need a hopeful utopian discourse. Degrowth is not only a scientific project but part of a broader social movement which works on the hope that we can downscale in an equitable and democratizing manner.

### AT: Past Brink

#### We must transition in the next few years – avoids disaster and extinction

**Taylor ‘8**

[Graeme, Adjunct Reader with the School of Integrative Systems, University of Queensland, Evolutions Edge, Introduction: The Evolutionary Challenge, http://www.bestfutures.org/images/documents/ee\_intro.pdf]

The challenge is not just to change our values and social institutions, but to change them quickly enough to avoid environmental and social disaster. But how can a world system based on power, violence and inequality become peaceful and just? Global problems often appear to be too large and complex to understand, let alone manage. This is because human societies, like weather systems, are open systems with chaotic and complex dynamics. However, since all open systems operate within definable parameters and follow predictable patterns, appropriate theories can be used to explain and predict the dynamics of both weather systems and societal systems. The key to analyzing and managing global change is to recognize that our industrial civilization is not only a dynamic system (with all the characteristics of dynamic systems) but also a living and evolving societal system. Evolutionary systems theory provides us with powerful tools from both the natural and social sciences for analyzing complex global problems.8 My father Alastair M. Taylor, a historian and political geographer, was the first to use evolutionary systems theory to explain the historical evolution of societal systems and worldviews.

While previous societal systems (historical ages) took thousands of years to develop, we have only a few years left in which to transform our civilization. Fortunately, we do not have to start from square one. Because the shift to a holistic society began over a hundred years ago, many of the key components of a sustainable societal system are already present.9Moreover, our species is constantly learning new skills and becoming increasingly adaptable.

### AT: No Mindset Shift

#### Yes mindset shift – economic collapse now key to transition

**Djordjevic ‘98**

[Johnny, BA Global Economics, Interdisciplinary Minor in Global Sustainability Senior Seminar University of California, Irvine, “Sustainability,” http://www.dbc.uci.edu/sustain/global/sensem/djordj98.html]

Max Weber believed in the power of an idea. This political theorist discussed how Calvinism was one idea that perpetuated the rise of capitalism. Few people ever examine the power of an idea, but if one examines and contemplates this theory, a realization comes across: that ideas drive society. The key premise is that some values of our society must be altered in order to avert catastrophic consequences. The way of life in developed countries is "the origin of many of our most serious problems"(Trainer, 1985). Because developed countries have high material living standards and consume massive quantities of all resources, "hundreds of millions of people in desperate need must go without the materials and energy that could improve their conditions while these resources flow into developed countries, often to produce frivolous luxuries"(Trainer, 1985).

People's way of life seems to be a glaring example of values leading to high rates of personal consumption of resources and the waste of these same materials. In addition to overconsumption, the services used to supply our society with goods, (examples of these goods would be food, water, energy, and sewage services.) tends to be wasteful and expensive. Production is organized in such a way, (usually highly centralized) that travel becomes an enormous burden. Another consideration is that our population is expected to increase to rise to eleven billion within the next half century. Considering the mineral and energy resources needed in the future, these estimates must also include the consumption of a population almost doubled from its current status and these same figures must include an expected increase in the affluence of developed countries. "If we are willing to endorse an already affluent society in which there is continued growth on this scale,(american resource use increasing 2% each year), then we are assuming that after 2050 something like 40 times as many resources can be provided each year as were provided in the 1970's, and that it is in order for people in a few rich countries to live in this superaffluent way while the other 9.5 billion in the world do not"(Trainer, 1985).

The environment is in danger from our pursuit of affluence. Serious worries come from predictions about the atmosphere. The burning of fossil fuels will raise temperatures and result in climatic effects. Rising temperatures could have horrific effects. First of all, food production could seriously be imperiled even by increases of only one degree celcius. If the temperature should increase by five degrees scientists predict the coastal island nations would be submerged and possibly trigger the next ice age. Another environmental concern deals with the soil. Our agricultural practices disregard the value of recycling food waste. Also, the use of pesticides and chemicals in agriculture lead to the poisoning of the soil and topsoil loss through erosion. Yields per acre for grain are falling and "we do not produce food in ways that can be continued for centuries"(Trainer, 1985). Even more disturbing is the deforestation of rainforests. This results in the extinction of many species, concentration of carbon dioxide, the loss of many potential medical breakthroughs, and possibly the disruption of rainfall. Opponents of the deforestation fail to realize that our expensive way of life and greedy economic system are the driving forces. "Nothing can be achieved by fighting to save this forest or that species if in the long term we do not change the economic system which demands ever-increasing production and consumption of non-necessities"(Trainer, 1985).

There also lies a problem in the Third World. Developed countries high living standards and quest for an ever-increasing quality of life lead to Third World poverty and the deprivation of the Third World's access to its own resources. As Third World countries get deprived of materials, the developed world consumes and imports over half of their resources. A few developed countries seem to be consuming the globe's resources and this consumption rate is always increasing. "The rich must live more simply that the poor may simply live"(Trainer, 1985). The Third World is exploited in many ways. One way is that the best land in a developing country is used for crops exported to developed countries, while citizens of the Third World starve and suffer. Another way is the poor working conditions of the Third World. A third exploitation can be overlooked but no less disgusting; "The world's greatest health problem could be simply by providing water for the perhaps 2.000 million people who now have to drink form rivers and wells contained by human and animal wastes. Technically it is a simple matter to set up plants for producing iron and plastic pipes. But most of the world's iron and plastic goes into the production of luxurious cars, soft-drink containers, office blocks and similar things in rich countries"(Trainer, 1985).

The threat of nuclear war and international conflict rises with countries of all kinds entranced with the logic and idea of materialism. Perhaps the most dangerous and likely chances for a nuclear conflict arise from the competition for dwindling resources by developed countries. Similar events can be seen all across the globe. Major superpowers get themselves involved in domestic matters not concerning them, providing arms and advice to try and obtain the inside track on possible resources. International tension will rise in the competition for resources and so will the "ever-increasing probability of nuclear war"(Trainer, 1985).

As developed countries pursue affluence they fail to see the inherent contradiction in this idea; as growth is the quest, the quality of life will decrease. For a healthy community, there exists a list of non-material conditions which must be present, "a sense of purpose, fulfilling work and leisure, supportive social relations, peace of mind, security from theft and violence, and caring and co-operative neighborhoods"(Trainer, 1985). And as developed countries think their citizens are the happiest in the world, "In most affluent societies rates of divorce, drug-taking, crime, mental breakdown, child abuse, alcoholism, vandalism, suicide, stress, depression, and anxiety are increasing"(Trainer, 1985).

Despite all the gloomy facts and sad stories, there is a solution, to create a sustainable society. Rather than being greedy and only thinking about the self, each individual must realize the impacts of his/her selfish tendencies, and disregard their former view of the world. One must come into harmony with what is really needed to survive, and drawn a strict distinction between what is necessity and what is luxury. Not every family needs three cars, or five meals a day or four telephones and two refrigerators. Countries do not need to strive for increasing growth, less materials could be imported/exported and international tension could be greatly reduced. The major problems seem not to step from the determination of what a sustainable society is, but on how to get people to change their values. This task is not an easy one. People must be forced to realize the harmful and catastrophic consequences lie in their meaningless wants and greed. The problem of cognitive dissonance is hard to overcome, but it is not impossible. The solution to this dilemma lies in castastrophe. The only event that changes people's minds is social trauma or harm. The analogy is that a person who refuses to wear a seat belt and one day gets thrown through his/her windshield will remember to wear the seat belt after the accident. The logic behind this argument is both simple and feasible. So the question of dissonance is answered in part, but to change a whole society obviously takes a bigger and more traumatic event to occur. An economic collapse or ice age would trigger a new consciousness leading to a sustainable society.

### AT: Simon

#### Simon’s methodology is flawed – means it’s not predictive

**Trainer ‘1**

[Visiting Fellow in the Faculty of Arts at the University of NSW Ted, “Natural Capitalism – Cannot Overcome Resource Limits”, Minnesotans For Sustainability]

Simon's two most influential works have been The Ultimate Resource (1981) and with Herman Khan The Resourceful Earth, (1984). The concern in the following brief discussion is primarily to draw attention to the curious forms of argument evident in these works. Their weaknesses tend not to be recognised by many who are impressed by Simon's reputation and claims but who have not read his arguments.

Simon's core logic is simply to analyse solely in terms of previous dollar cost trends. "Historical trends are the best basis for predicting the trends of future costs." (1981, p. 27.) Both Simon's main books examine data on resource, energy, land etc. costs and find that in virtually all cases costs have fallen continuously, meaning that they have been becoming less scarce. This is taken to be a sufficient case for the claim that scarcities will not be encountered in the future.

The insufficiency of this general approach would seem to require little demonstration. Firstly the evaluation of some of the most urgent limits to growth concerns does not directly involve dollar cost calculations, most obviously regarding whether or not the greenhouse problem or the loss of biodiversity are becoming critical, or whether our ecological footprint is unsustainable. More importantly, often the concern is that there might be good reasons for believing that the future will be radically different from the past. This is especially so with respect to petroleum supply (see below.) In general the appropriate considerations are to do with our understanding of the systems in question and with whether or not these involve factors likely to make the future unpleasantly unlike the past. In many areas there are good reasons to think the future will indeed be quite different from the past, and in general Simon flails to deal adequately with these considerations.

### Short-term collapse good

#### Collapse now is best—it spurs a transition to sustainable societies.

Lewis 98 — Chris H. Lewis, Instructor in the Sewall American Studies Program at the University of Colorado, 1998 (“The Paradox of Global Development and the Necessary Collapse of Modern Industrial Civilization," *The Coming Age of Scarcity: Preventing Mass Death and Genocide in the Twenty-first Century*, edited by Michael N. Dobkowski and Isidor Wallimann, Published by Syracuse University Press, ISBN 0815627440, p. 44-45)

I will argue that we are witnessing the collapse of global industrial civilization. Driven by individualism, materialism, and the endless pursuit of wealth and power, the modern industrialized world’s efforts to modernize and integrate the world politically, economically, and culturally since World War II are only accelerating this global collapse. In the late-twentieth century, global development leaves 80 percent of the world’s population outside the industrialized nations’ progress and affluence (Wallimann 1994). When the modern industrialized world collapses, people in the underdeveloped world will continue their daily struggle for dignity and survival at the margins of a moribund global industrial civilization.

With the collapse of the modern world, smaller, autonomous, local and regional civilizations, cultures, and polities will emerge. We can reduce the threat of mass death and genocide that will surely accompany this collapse by encouraging the creation and growth of sustainable, self-sufficient regional polities. John Cobb has already made a case for how this may work in the United States and how it is working in Kerala, India. After the collapse of global civilization, modern peoples will not have the material resources, biological capital, and energy to reestablish global civilization. Forced by economic necessity to become dependent on local resources and ecosystems for their survival, peoples throughout the world will work to conserve and restore their [end page 44] environments. For the societies that destroy their local environments and economies, as modern people so often do, will themselves face collapse and ruin.

## \*\*\* Impact

### MPX Defense – No war

#### No impact – econ decline doesn’t cause war

Barnett ‘9(Thomas P.M. Barnett, senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC, “The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis,” 8/25/2009)

When the global financial crisis struck roughly a year ago, the blogosphere was ablaze with all sorts of scary predictions of, and commentary regarding, ensuing conflict and wars -- a rerun of the Great Depression leading to world war, as it were. Now, as global economic news brightens and recovery -- surprisingly led by China and emerging markets -- is the talk of the day, it's interesting to look back over the past year and realize how globalization's first truly worldwide recession has had virtually no impact whatsoever on the international security landscape. None of the more than three-dozen ongoing conflicts listed by GlobalSecurity.org can be clearly attributed to the global recession. Indeed, the last new entry (civil conflict between Hamas and Fatah in the Palestine) predates the economic crisis by a year, and three quarters of the chronic struggles began in the last century. Ditto for the 15 low-intensity conflicts listed by Wikipedia (where the latest entry is the Mexican "drug war" begun in 2006). Certainly, the Russia-Georgia conflict last August was specifically timed, but by most accounts the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics was the most important external trigger (followed by the U.S. presidential campaign) for that sudden spike in an almost two-decade long struggle between Georgia and its two breakaway regions. Looking over the various databases, then, we see a most familiar picture: the usual mix of civil conflicts, insurgencies, and liberation-themed terrorist movements. Besides the recent Russia-Georgia dust-up, the only two potential state-on-state wars (North v. South Korea, Israel v. Iran) are both tied to one side acquiring a nuclear weapon capacity -- a process wholly unrelated to global economic trends. And with the United States effectively tied down by its two ongoing major interventions (Iraq and Afghanistan-bleeding-into-Pakistan), our involvement elsewhere around the planet has been quite modest, both leading up to and following the onset of the economic crisis: e.g., the usual counter-drug efforts in Latin America, the usual military exercises with allies across Asia, mixing it up with pirates off Somalia's coast). Everywhere else we find serious instability we pretty much let it burn, occasionally pressing the Chinese -- unsuccessfully -- to do something. Our new Africa Command, for example, hasn't led us to anything beyond advising and training local forces. So, to sum up: \* No significant uptick in mass violence or unrest (remember the smattering of urban riots last year in places like Greece, Moldova and Latvia?); \* The usual frequency maintained in civil conflicts (in all the usual places); \* Not a single state-on-state war directly caused (and no great-power-on-great-power crises even triggered); \* No great improvement or disruption in great-power cooperation regarding the emergence of new nuclear powers (despite all that diplomacy); \* A modest scaling back of international policing efforts by the system's acknowledged Leviathan power (inevitable given the strain); and \* No serious efforts by any rising great power to challenge that Leviathan or supplant its role. (The worst things we can cite are Moscow's occasional deployments of strategic assets to the Western hemisphere and its weak efforts to outbid the United States on basing rights in Kyrgyzstan; but the best include China and India stepping up their aid and investments in Afghanistan and Iraq.) Sure, we've finally seen global defense spending surpass the previous world record set in the late 1980s, but even that's likely to wane given the stress on public budgets created by all this unprecedented "stimulus" spending. If anything, the friendly cooperation on such stimulus packaging was the most notable great-power dynamic caused by the crisis. Can we say that the world has suffered a distinct shift to political radicalism as a result of the economic crisis? Indeed, no. The world's major economies remain governed by center-left or center-right political factions that remain decidedly friendly to both markets and trade. In the short run, there were attempts across the board to insulate economies from immediate damage (in effect, as much protectionism as allowed under current trade rules), but there was no great slide into "trade wars." Instead, the World Trade Organization is functioning as it was designed to function, and regional efforts toward free-trade agreements have not slowed. Can we say Islamic radicalism was inflamed by the economic crisis? If it was, that shift was clearly overwhelmed by the Islamic world's growing disenchantment with the brutality displayed by violent extremist groups such as al-Qaida. And looking forward, austere economic times are just as likely to breed connecting evangelicalism as disconnecting fundamentalism. At the end of the day, the economic crisis did not prove to be sufficiently frightening to provoke major economies into establishing global regulatory schemes, even as it has sparked a spirited -- and much needed, as I argued last week -- discussion of the continuing viability of the U.S. dollar as the world's primary reserve currency. Naturally, plenty of experts and pundits have attached great significance to this debate, seeing in it the beginning of "economic warfare" and the like between "fading" America and "rising" China. And yet, in a world of globally integrated production chains and interconnected financial markets, such "diverging interests" hardly constitute signposts for wars up ahead. Frankly, I don't welcome a world in which America's fiscal profligacy goes undisciplined, so bring it on -- please! Add it all up and it's fair to say that this global financial crisis has proven the great resilience of America's post-World War II international liberal trade order.

#### Economic collapse doesn’t cause instability

Fareed Zakaria was named editor of Newsweek International in October 2000, overseeing all Newsweek editions abroad, December 12, 2009, “The Secrets of Stability,” http://www.newsweek.com/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.html

Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all.

#### Weak economies solve war

Bennett and Nordstrom, 2000 – (Feb. 2000, D. Scott Bennett and Timothy Nordstrom, Professors of Political Science at Pennsylvania State University, “Foreign Policy Substitutability and Internal Economic Problems in Enduring Rivalries,” Journal of Conflict Resolution, JStor, Accessed 07/29/2012, ZR)

Conflict settlement is also a distinct route to dealing with internal problems that leaders in rivalries may pursue when faced with internal problems. Military competition between states requires large amounts of resources, and rivals require even more attention. Leaders may choose to negotiate a settlement that ends a rivalry to free up important resources that may be reallocated to the domestic economy. In a "guns versus butter" world of economic trade-offs, when a state can no longer afford to pay the expenses associated with competition in a rivalry, it is quite rational for leaders to reduce costs by ending a rivalry. This gain (a peace dividend) could be achieved at any time by ending a rivalry. However, such a gain is likely to be most important and attractive to leaders when internal conditions are bad and the leader is seeking ways to alleviate active problems. Support for policy change away from continued rivalry is more likely to develop when the economic situation sours and elites and masses are looking for ways to improve a worsening situation. It is at these times that the pressure to cut military investment will be greatest and that state leaders will be forced to recognize the difficulty of continuing to pay for a rivalry. Among other things, this argument also encompasses the view that the cold war ended because the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics could no longer compete economically with the United States.

#### No impact to collapse

Assadourian 12 MOVI NG TOWAR D S U STAI NAB LE P ROS PER ITY THE WORLDWATCH INSTITUTE Erik Assadourian State of the World 2012 http://blogs.worldwatch.org/sustainableprosperity/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/SOW12\_chap\_2.pdf

Degrowth in a globalized culture where growth is seen to be essential for economic success and societal well-being seems to be a political non-starter even for those who may be sympathetic. For most people, who deeply believe growth is essential to modern economies, it seems to be a recipe for economic and societal collapse. But the rapidly warming Earth and other declines in ecosystem services reveal that economic degrowth is essential and will need to be pursued as quickly as possible in order to stabilize Earth’s climate and prevent irreparable harm to the planet and, in the process, human civilization. 3 Already, the conversation is changing in the media and among scientists. The hope of preventing a temperature rise of 2 degrees Celsius is weakening. Numerous studies have found that humanity is now on a path to increase the average global temperature by 4 degrees Celsius. Most recently, the journal Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society2 Degrowth is the intentional redirection of economies away from the perpetual pursuit of growth. For economies beyond the limits of their ecosystems, this includes a planned and controlled contraction to get back in line with planetary boundaries, with the eventual creation of a steady-state economic system that is in balance with Earth’s limits. Degrowth should not be confused with economic decline. As Serge Latouche, a leading thinker on degrowth, explains, “The movement for a ‘degrowth society’ is radically different from the recession that is widespread today. Degrowth does not mean the decay or suffering often imagined by those new to this concept. Instead, degrowth can be compared to a healthy diet voluntarily undertaken to improve a person’s well-being, while negative economic growth can be compared to starvation.” Ultimately degrowth is a process, not the end point. As Latouche notes, the end point is abandoning faith in the promise of growth as driver of development. Economist Tim Jackson puts this idea in a user-friendly way, calling for “prosperity without growth.” However, that prosperity should not be confused with what is deemed prosperity by many today—a consumer lifestyle—as that depends on a growth economic model and overuse of Earth’s natural capital. Instead, as Latouche explains, a prosperous society is one “in which we can live better lives whilst working less and consuming less.” Thus degrowth will be a step toward a more secure, sustainable, sane, and just future, helping to reduce the number and size of ecologically destructive industries and to reorient economies in ways that improve wellbeing, strengthen community resilience, and restore Earth’s systems—a path that from any sane perspective would be hard to confuse with economic decline even examined projections of a 4 degree increase not by 2100 but by 2060, following the path of emissions that society is currently on. This path translates to catastrophe for human society: massive shifts in population as coasts flood, areas hit by extreme weather and droughts, and diseases spread to new areas.

#### Shortage of resources solves war

Bennett and Nordstrom, 2000 – (D. Scott Bennett and Timothy Nordstrom, Department of Political Science Professors at Pennsylvania State. “Foreign Policy Substitutability and Internal Economic Problems in Enduring Rivalries,” February 2000, Journal of Conflict Resolution, JStor, Accessed 07/29/2012, ZR)

In this analysis, we focus on using economic conditions to understand when rival-

ries are likely to escalate or end. Rivalries are an appropriate set of cases to use when

examining substitutability both because leaders in rival states have clearly substitut-

able choices and because rivalries are a set of cases in which externalization is a par-

ticularly plausible policy option. In particular, when confronted with domestic prob-

lems, leaders in a rivalry have the clear alternatives of escalating the conflict with the

rival to divert attention or to work to settle the rivalry as a means of freeing up a sub-

stantial amount of resources that can be directed toward solving internal problems. In

the case of the diversion option, rivals provide logical, believable actors for leaders to

target; the presence of a clear rival may offer unstable elites a particularly inviting tar-

get for hostile statements or actual conflict as necessary. The public and relevant elites

already consider the rival a threat or else the rivalry would not have continued for an

extended period; the presence of disputed issues also provides a casus belli with the

rival that is always present. Rivals also may provide a target where the possible costs

and risks of externalization are relatively controlled. If the goal is diversion, leaders

will want to divert attention without provoking an actual (and expensive) war. Over the

course of many confrontations, rival states may learn to anticipate response patterns,

leading to safer disputes or at least to leaders believing that they can control the risks of

conflict when they initiate a new confrontation. In sum, rivals provide good targets for

domestically challenged political leaders.

### Impact Framing

#### It’s try or die – growth is inevitable, only collapse prevents extinction.

**Brent 11 –** frequent contributor to Countercurrents, expert on population issues

(Jason, “Billions Of Humans Will Die Horribly,” <http://www.countercurrents.org/brent090111.htm>, dml)

**The simple questions become can the earth provide those resources to humanity in 2050** when the resources used between 1950 and 2050 are taken into consideration and if the earth can provide the resources for how long can they be provided? While no one can provide an absolute answers to those questions, **it would be the height of folly for humanity to gamble its survival on the ability for the earth to provide** in 2050 8.41 times the resources it provided in 1950 **and it would be extremely foolish for humanity to gamble its survival that the earth could continue providing those resources for any length of time.** Humanity has two choices---reduce population or reduce the per capita usage of resources, **There are no other choices. If humanity does not reduce** population and/or reduce per capita **usage of resources, the earth will be unable to supply the resources civilization needs to function and the population will be reduced by nature**--by war, starvation, disease, ethnic cleansing and other horrors.

### Growth Bad – War

#### Globalization is making war more dangerous and changing the way it is fought – simplistic statistics don’t assume the changing nature of war and new transnational threats.

Echevarria 03 – (Mar. 2003, Lieutenant Colonel Antulio J. Echevarria, PhD in History, Princeton University, Director of Research for the U.S. Army War College, 23 year long military career, published extensively in scholarly and professional journals on topics related to military history and theory and strategic thinking, graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, and the U.S. Army War College, “GLOBALIZATION AND THE NATURE OF WAR,” Strategic Studies Institute,[http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub215.pdf](http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub215.pdf%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) ZR) Despite its apparent positive impact on the spread of democracy and free-market economies, globalization might produce a more dangerous and unpredictable world, especially if the cultural backlash it has generated thus far gathers more momentum. This world might be characterized by shifting power relationships, ad hoc security arrangements, and an ever-widening gap between the richest and poorest nations. 8 A number of new democracies—lacking strong traditions for maintaining checks and balances—might, for example, collapse after only transitory successes. Transnational threats, such as international crime syndicates, terrorist networks, and drug cartels, could continue to grow in strength and influence, thriving among autocratic, weak, or so-called failed states. And, ethnic rivalries, nationalism, religiousbased antagonisms, and competition for scarce resources, including water, could go unresolved. Thus, serious crises would undoubtedly arise, especially as the world’s population continues to grow. On the other hand, globalization could give rise to a more stable world in which national interests merge into the general aim of promoting peace, stability, and economic prosperity. 9 In this world, the rule of law and the existence of pluralistic political systems would continue to spread; and the number of free-market economies would expand, distributing economic prosperity still further. Even if this “Utopia” should materialize, a number of crises—some of which will undoubtedly require military intervention—will most likely have had to occur beforehand, since most autocratic regimes will probably not surrender power without a fight. Moreover, as the 1999 Kosovo crisis 2demonstrated, even relatively small states armed primarily with conventional weapons can pose significant security challenges to a superpower and its strategic partners. 10 The world need not devolve into a “clash of civilizations” or a “coming anarchy,” therefore, in order for military power to continue to play a significant role in the future. 11 In any case, globalization will surely continue and may even accelerate if data concerning the rate of technological change are any indication. 12 As numerous studies and strategic papers have pointed out, globalization is already changing how wars are being fought in the 21st century, making them more dangerous than in any previous era. 13 At a minimum, the greater mobility of people, things, and ideas will mean increased mobility for nonstate actors, weapons of mass destruction, and radical fundamentalism of all types. In fact, the U.S. Department of State currently reports that more than 60 active terrorist groups exist (with some 100,000 members); and over one-third of them have the capacity for global reach. 14 Furthermore, today’s terrorists have proven very adaptive, learning from previous generations, and changing their tactics in response to new anti-terrorist measures. 15 Globalization clearly offers them some extraordinary capabilities to communicate and coordinate their efforts. Globalization also facilitates the proliferation of destabilizing capabilities, such as weapons of mass destruction or mass effect. Eleven countries currently have nuclear weapons programs; thirteen more are actively seeking them. 16 More than 25 countries now possess ballistic missiles, and over 75,000 cruise missiles are in existence, with the number expected to rise to between 80,000 and 90,000 by 2010. 17 Also, at least 17 countries— including the so-called “Axis of Evil”—currently have active chemical and biological weapons programs, and the number is rising. 18 As the Assistant Secretary of State for Non-proliferation recently explained, despite the provisions 3of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and the Chemical and Biological Weapons conventions, proliferation of chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and high explosive/high yield weapons continues worldwide: “There is an intense sort of cooperation that goes on among countries that are trying to acquire such weapons.” 19 For example, China and North Korea have long contributed to the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons, both for strategic leverage against the United States and for economic advantages. 20 Thus, globalization assists some powerful motives that run counter to nonproliferation efforts. Biological weapons, especially, pose a serious threat not only to human populations, but also to agriculture and livestock. Unfortunately, U.S. crops lack genetic diversity, rendering them vulnerable to disease. Furthermore, the nation’s centralized feeding and marketing practices make livestock extremely vulnerable to a biological attack. If such an attack were to occur, a devastating ripple effect would surely spread throughout the global economy since the United States produces 30-50 percent of the world’s foodstuffs. 21 Globalization has also introduced a new form of warfare: cyber-war. More than 30 countries—including Russia, China, and several so-called rogue states—have developed or are developing the capability to launch strategic-level cyber attacks. 22 The interconnectedness of many nations’ infrastructures means that a successful cyber attack against a single sector in one country could result in adverse effects in other sectors within the same country, or those of its neighbors. Indeed, intended (and unintended) adverse effects could well travel globally. 23 If globalization is making war more dangerous and adding new dimensions to it (such as cyber space), is it in some way changing the nature of war? What exactly is the nature of war? These questions are of more than a purely 4academic interest, since the nature of a thing tends to define how it can and cannot be used.

#### Attempts to maintain growth spark global conflict—the root cause of war is the pursuit of economic expansion.

Trainer 98 — Ted Trainer, Lecturer in Sociology at the University of New South Wales, 1998 ("Our Unsustainable Society: Basic Causes, Interconnections, and Solutions," *The Coming Age of Scarcity: Preventing Mass Death and Genocide in the Twenty-first Century*, edited by Michael N. Dobkowski and Isidor Wallimann, Published by Syracuse University Press, ISBN 0815627440, p. 91-92)

Some of the most disturbing implications of the limits-to-growth analysis of the global situation arise regarding the problems of peace and conflict. The foregoing argument has been that only a few can have the life-styles that we in rich countries have, and we can have them only for a historically short period, because there are not enough resources for all to rise to anything like the living standards we take for granted. But we who have per capita incomes averaging sixty times those of the poorest half of the world’s people are obsessed with getting richer as fast as possible and without end. Now, if we and all others continue to pursue that goal, as population doubles, and resources become scarcer, there can be no other conceivable outcome than increasing levels of conflict in the world.

Much of the foregoing argument has been that we have an empire, a sphere of influence, without which our living standards could not be as high as they are. We have to be extensively involved in military activity to secure our lines of supply from the empire. We could not be sure of getting all that oil from the Middle East if we did not have aircraft carriers in the Mediterranean, rapid deployment forces specially trained and ready to fly into trouble spots, minesweepers able to clear vital shipping lanes, the military presence that stands as a warning to others that they had better not interfere with “our” oil fields, and the contingency plans for dealing with any rebel tribesmen or any sectional uprising that might cut the pipelines. We must be able to protect our allies, interests, trading arrangements, and clients.

United States Army Gen. M. D. Taylor said that “U.S. military priorities must be shifted. . . towards insuring a steady flow of resources from the Third World.” He referred to “a fierce competition among industrial powers for the same raw materials markets sought by the United States” and “growing hostility displayed by have-not nations towards their affluent counterparts” (Cypher 1981). Speaking to American soldiers at Camp Stanly, Korea, President Johnson said, “Don’t forget, there are two hundred million of us in a world of three billion. They want what we’ve got—and we’re not going to give it to them!” Ashley says that “expansion is a prime source of conflict. War is mainly explicable in terms of differential growth in a world of scarce and unevenly distributed resources” (1980, 3, 126). Nettleship makes the same point: “War is an inevitable result of the struggle between [end page 91] economies for expansion” (1975, 497). Chase-Dunn says that “warfare appears as a normal and periodic form of competition within the capitalist world economy.. . . World wars regularly occur during a period of economic expansion” (1989, 108, 163).

In other words, the main source of conflict and war in the world is the ceaseless quest for greater wealth and power. We have no chance of achieving a peaceful world until nations stop being greedy and work out how to live without constantly striving to grow richer. Yet, the supreme commitment in our economy is to rapid and ceaseless growth!

#### Growth makes conflict inevitable—the drive to increase living standards is the root cause of war.

Trainer 2 — Ted Trainer, Visiting Fellow in the Faculty of Arts at the University of New South Wales, 2002 (“If You Want Affluence, Prepare For War,” *Democracy & Nature*, Volume 8, Number 2, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Academic Search Complete, p. 294-295)

As is the case with the other major problems confronting the planet, such as environmental destruction, it is essential to understand the problem of global peace and conflict from the ‘limits to growth’ perspective. This analysis focuses on the fact that the present living standards of the rich countries involve levels of production and consumption that are grossly unsustainable. Just to note a few of the lines of argument documented in the large literature from the limits perspective, first, if all 9 billion people likely to live on Earth by 2070 were to have the present rich world lifestyle and ‘footprint’ we would need about 12 times the area of productive land that exists on the entire planet. Second, if we were to cut greenhouse gas emissions sufficiently to prevent the carbon content of the atmosphere from increasing any more, world per capita energy consumption would have to be cut to about one-eighteenth of its present amount. If all 9 billion people likely by 2070 were to have the present rich world per capita resource consumption, resource production would have to be about eight times the present rate. [end page 294]

These multiples underline the magnitude of the overshoot. Sustainability will require enormous reductions in the volume of rich world production and consumption. Yet its supreme goal is economic growth, i.e. to increase the levels of production and consumption and GDP, constantly, rapidly and without any limit. That the absurdity of this is never recognised in conventional economic and political circles defies understanding. If we in rich countries average 3% economic growth to 2070 and by then all the world’s people had risen to the ‘living standards’ we would have by then, the total world economic output would be 60 times as great as the present grossly unsustainable level.

If this limits-to-growth analysis is at all valid, the implications for the problem of global peace and conflict and security are clear and savage. If we all remain determined to increase our living standards, our level of production and consumption, in a world where resources are already scarce, where only a few have affluent living standards but another 8 billion will be wanting them too, and which we, the rich, are determined to get richer without any limit, then nothing is more guaranteed than that there will be increasing levels of conflict and violence.

To put it another way, if we insist on remaining affluent we will need to remain heavily armed.

Increased conflict in at least the following categories can be expected. First, the present conflict over resources between the rich elites and the poor majority in the Third World must increase, for example, as ‘development’ under globalisation takes more land, water and forests into export markets. Second, there are conflicts between the Third World and the rich world, the major recent examples being the war between the US and Iraq over control of oil. Iraq invaded Kuwait and the US intervened, accompanied by much high-sounding rhetoric (having found nothing unacceptable about Israel’s invasions of Lebanon or the Indonesian invasion of East Timor). As has often been noted, had Kuwait been one of the world’s leading exporters of broccoli, rather than oil, it is doubtful whether the US would have been so eager to come to its defence. At the time of writing, the US is at war in Central Asia over ‘terrorism’. Few would doubt that a ‘collateral’ outcome will be the establishment of regimes that will give the West access to the oil wealth of Central Asia.

### Growth Bad – Disease

#### Growth leads to disease spread and mutation

**Hamburg ‘8**

[Margaret, FDA Commissioner, Senior Scientist Nuclear Threat Initiative, MD, “Germs Go Global: Why Emerging Infectious Diseases Are a Threat to America,” http://healthyamericans.org/assets/files/GermsGoGlobal.pdf]

Globalization, the worldwide movement toward economic, financial, trade, and communications integration, has impacted public health significantly. Technology and economic interdependence allow diseases to spread globally at rapid speeds. Experts believe that the increase in international travel and commerce, including the increasingly global nature of food handling, processing, and sales contribute to the spread of emerging infectious diseases.47 Increased global trade has also brought more and more people into contact with zoonosis -diseases that originated in animals before jumping to humans. For example, in 2003, the monkeypox virus entered the U.S. through imported Gambian giant rats sold in the nation’s under-regulated exotic pet trade. The rats infected pet prairie dogs, which passed the virus along to humans.48 International smuggling of birds, brought into the U.S. without undergoing inspection and/or quarantine, is of particular concern to public health experts who worry that it may be a pathway for the H5N1 “bird flu” virus to enter the country. Lower cost and efficient means of international transportation allow people to travel to more remote places and potential exposure to more infectious diseases. And the close proximity of passengers on passenger planes, trains, and cruise ships over the course of many hours puts people at risk for higher levels of exposure. If a person contracts a disease abroad, their symptoms may not emerge until they return home, having exposed others to the infection during their travels. In addition, planes and ships can themselves become breeding grounds for infectious diseases.

#### Diseases lead to extinction

Fox 97

C. William. Lieutenant COLONEL. 6/24/97. http://se1.isn.ch/serviceengine/FileContent?serviceID=ISN&fileid=4341F68C-1AF1-FEB7-10D7-5EE127216D05&lng=en.

HIV is a pandemic killer without a cure, and viruses such as Ebola-Zaire are merely a plane ride away from the population centers of the developed world. Viruses like ebola, which are endemic to Africa, have the potential to inflict morbidity and mortality on a scale not seen in the world since the Black Plague epidemics of medieval Europe (which killed a full quarter of Europe's population in the 13th and 14th centuries.)18 These diseases are not merely African problems, they present a real threat to mankind. They should be taken every bit as seriously as the concern for deliberate use of weapons of mass destruction.

### Growth bad – Terrorism

#### Globalization makes terrorism inevitable

**Cronin ‘3**

[Audrey Kurth Cronin is a Senior Associate at the Oxford Leverhulme Programme on the Changing Character of War, “Behind the Curve: Globalization and International Terrorism”, Project MUSE]
The objectives of international terrorism have also changed as a result of globalization. Foreign intrusions and growing awareness of shrinking global space have created incentives to use the ideal asymmetrical weapon, terrorism, for more ambitious purposes.

The political incentives to attack major targets such as the United States with powerful weapons have greatly increased. The perceived corruption of indigenous customs, religions, languages, economies, and so on are blamed on an international system often unconsciously molded by American behavior. The accompanying distortions in local communities as a result of exposure to the global marketplace of goods and ideas are increasingly blamed on U.S.sponsored modernization and those who support it. The advancement of technology, however, is not the driving force behind the terrorist threat to the United States and its allies, despite what some have assumed.59 Instead, at the heart of this threat are frustrated populations and international movements that are increasingly inclined to lash out against U.S.-led globalization.

As Christopher Coker observes, globalization is reducing tendencies toward instrumental violence (i.e., violence between states and even between communities), but it is enhancing incentives for expressive violence (or violence that is ritualistic, symbolic, and communicative).60 The new international terrorism is increasingly engendered by a need to assert identity or meaning against forces of homogeneity, especially on the part of cultures that are threatened by, or left behind by, the secular future that Western-led globalization brings.

According to a report recently published by the United Nations Development Programme, the region of greatest deªcit in measures of human development— the Arab world—is also the heart of the most threatening religiously inspired terrorism.61 Much more work needs to be done on the signiªcance of this correlation, but increasingly sources of political discontent are arising from disenfranchised areas in the Arab world that feel left behind by the promise of globalization and its assurances of broader freedom, prosperity, and access to knowledge. The results are dashed expectations, heightened resentment of the perceived U.S.-led hegemonic system, and a shift of focus away from more proximate targets within the region.

Of course, the motivations behind this threat should not be oversimpliªed: Anti-American terrorism is spurred in part by a desire to change U.S. policy in the Middle East and Persian Gulf regions as well as by growing antipathy in the developing world vis-à-vis the forces of globalization. It is also crucial to distinguish between the motivations of leaders such as Osama bin Laden and their followers. The former seem to be more driven by calculated strategic decisions to shift the locus of attack away from repressive indigenous governments to the more attractive and media-rich target of the United States. The latter appear to be more driven by religious concepts cleverly distorted to arouse anger and passion in societies full of pent-up frustration. To some degree, terrorism is directed against the United States because of its engagement and policies in various regions.62 Anti-Americanism is closely related to antiglobalization, because (intentionally or not) the primary driver of the powerful forces resulting in globalization is the United States.

Analyzing terrorism as something separate from globalization is misleading and potentially dangerous. Indeed globalization and terrorism are intricately intertwined forces characterizing international security in the twenty-ªrst century. The main question is whether terrorism will succeed in disrupting the promise of improved livelihoods for millions of people on Earth. Globalization is not an inevitable, linear development, and it can be disrupted by such unconventional means as international terrorism. Conversely, modern international terrorism is especially dangerous because of the power that it potentially derives from globalization—whether through access to CBNR weapons, global media outreach, or a diverse network of ªnancial and information resources.

#### Terrorism leads to extinction – retaliation

Speice 6

Speice, Patrick F., Jr. "Negligence and nuclear nonproliferation: eliminating the current liability barrier to bilateral U.S.-Russian nonproliferation assistance programs." William and Mary Law Review 47.4 (Feb 2006): 1427(59). Expanded Academic ASAP.

The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses. (49) Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict. (50) In addition to the threat posed by terrorists, leakage of nuclear knowledge and material from Russia will reduce the barriers that states with nuclear ambitions face and may trigger widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons. (51) This proliferation will increase the risk of nuclear attacks against the United States or its allies by hostile states, (52) as well as increase the likelihood that regional conflicts will draw in the United States and escalate to the use of nuclear weapons. (53)

### Growth Bad – Warming

#### Continued growth guarantees extinction via climate change

Milbrath 3 — Lester W. Milbrath, Director Emeritus of the Research Program in Environment and Society at the State University of New York at Buffalo, 2003

["Envisioning a Sustainable Society," *Explorations in Environmental Political Theory: Thinking About What We Value*, edited by Joel Jay Kassiola, Published by M.E. Sharpe, ISBN 0765610523, p.39-40)

Our use of resources and discharge of wastes more than doubles with each doubling of the human population. Those growth rates cannot help but force a great transformation. Growth simply cannot continue for two reasons: More than half the resources in the earth’s crust have been consumed and scattered, and there simply will not be sufficient resources for all those new humans, even at present consumption rates.

Even more important, the emission of greenhouse gases (carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxides, and chlorofluorocarbons) is beginning to change the way the biosphere works. Scientists estimate that the earth will warm three to five degrees Celsius in the next seven decades, perhaps sooner (with even more heating up predicted in the most recent research findings in 2001). That will be sufficient to change climate patterns. We cannot be sure that the climate will change gradually and then settle down into a new pattern; it is likely to oscillate unpredictably and bring unexpected catastrophe. You have probably read predictions of good farmland turning to desert, devastating floods, rising sea levels, killer hurricanes. Climate change and loss of the ozone layer will injure ecosystems all over the planet and reduce their productivity at the very time all those new humans will be looking for sustenance.

Equally devastating, climatic instability would destroy the confidence people need in order to invest. People will not be sure that they could ever live in the house they would like to build. Entrepreneurs would have little confidence that their business could get supplies or that their goods would have a market. Investors would fear that their stocks, bonds, and loans would become worthless. Young people would not know how to plan for a career. If the climate oscillates unpredictably, we will become victims of our own success. Be forewarned: Chaos in climate patterns means economic catastrophe.

By just doing what we have been doing every day, we are unintentionally [end page 39] conducting a giant planetary experiment to see how far we can perturb biospheric systems before they change their patterns and drastically change everything about our lives. By being single-mindedly successful at doing what society expects of us, we have created a civilization that is headed for breakdown. We are facing a massive transformation of modern society that we cannot avoid. We should change the direction of our society now before we find out the answer to that unintended experiment. In Earth time we have less than one second to make the necessary changes. Either we learn to control our growth in population and in economic activity or nature will control it for us. Remember, nature’s solution is death.

#### Warming Causes Extinction

Mazo 10 – PhD in Paleoclimatology from UCLA, Jeffrey Mazo, Managing Editor, Survival and Research Fellow for Environmental Security and Science Policy at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, 3-2010, “Climate Conflict: How global warming threatens security and what to do about it,” pg. 122

The best estimates for global warming to the end of the century range from 2.5-4.~C above pre-industrial levels, depending on the scenario. Even in the best-case scenario, the low end of the likely range is 1.6°C, and in the worst 'business as usual' projections, which actual emissions have been matching, the range of likely warming runs from 3.1--7.1°C. Even keeping emissions at constant 2000 levels (which have already been exceeded), global temperature would still be expected to reach 1.2°C (O'9""1.5°C)above pre-industrial levels by the end of the century." Without early and severe reductions in emissions, the effects of climate change in the second half of the twenty-first century are likely to be catastrophic for the stability and security of countries in the developing world - not to mention the associated human tragedy. Climate change could even undermine the strength and stability of emerging and advanced economies, beyond the knock-on effects on security of widespread state failure and collapse in developing countries.' And although they have been condemned as melodramatic and alarmist, many informed observers believe that unmitigated climate change beyond the end of the century could pose an existential threat to civilisation." What is certain is that there is no precedent in human experience for such rapid change or such climatic conditions, and even in the best case adaptation to these extremes would mean profound social, cultural and political changes.

#### Econ collapse solves warming- empirics

Schneidera et al 10 François Schneidera, Giorgos Kallisa, Joan Martinez-Aliera

Crisis or opportunity? Economic degrowth for social equity and ecological sustainability. Introduction to this special issue Accepted 13 January 2010. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652610000259

The collapse of the fictitious economy had real impacts. Because of the economic crisis, and despite growth in India, China, Indonesia, the world trend towards increased emissions of carbon dioxide (3 per cent growth in emissions per year up to 2007) has been stopped, and there has been a reduction of three per cent [44]. This is too little compared with the IPCC recommended reduction of over 60 per cent but it shows that more than the Kyoto commitment and more than technological changes, it is economic degrowth that achieves greenhouse gas emission reductions. Similarly, because of the decrease in external demand for exports, the rate of deforestation in the Brazil Amazon has decreased to “only” 7000 sq. km. in the year 2008 [45]. Economic degrowth can be good for the environment. It helped to reach goals that 20 years of talking about sustainable development did not achieve.

### Warming T/ Econ Collapse

#### Climate change turns econ collapse

Assadourian 12 MOVI NG TOWAR D S U STAI NAB LE P ROS PER ITY THE WORLDWATCH INSTITUTE Erik Assadourian State of the World 2012 http://blogs.worldwatch.org/sustainableprosperity/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/SOW12\_chap\_2.pdf

 And the 2011 climate talks in Durban did nothing to stop the world’s rush to this future. 4 With governments like Canada pulling out of the Kyoto Protocol and with a new climate agreement probably stalled until 2020, the world is in all likelihood in for massive ecological shifts, which needless to say are incompatible with a growing global economy. Indeed, in 2007 the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change projected that climate change could reduce global economic well-being anywhere from 5 to 20 percent (measured in per capita consumption terms), depending on how much human activities warm the world. 5 These ecological changes are brought ever closer and made ever larger by people’s continued belief that growth by all on an overtaxed planet is a useful pursuit. In the past half-century, growth has been understood as the cure-all to societal problems. In reality, while it may help sometimes, continued economic growth is at the root of ecological shifts that will cause far worse problems. As the Prince of Wales noted in May 2011, “Our myopic determination to ignore the facts and to continue with business as usual is, I fear, creating the risk of a crash which will be far more dramatic, and far harder to recover from, than anything we have experienced over the past few years.” 6 And while that may be evident to those who study environmental trends, society is committed to growth that even many environmentalists and sustainable development experts still advocate for “green growth,” or just the decoupling of growth from material consumption. As Harald Welzer, author of Mental Infrastructures: How Growth Entered the World and Our Souls, notes, “The current debate on decoupling…serves above all to maintain the illusion that we can make a sufficient number of minor adjustments in order to reduce the negative environmental consequences of economic growth while leaving our present system intact.” But humanity needs to radically transform the global economy, reducing its size by at least one third—based on the conservative ecological footprint indicator, which finds that humanity is currently using the ecological capacity of 1.5 Earths—even while the poorest one third of humanity needs to increase total consumption considerably in order to achieve a decent quality of life. 7

### AT: Tech solves Environment

#### Technology can’t solve environment harms – reducing consumption is key

**Godhaven ‘9**

[Merrick is an environmental writer and activist. He co-authored the Corporate Watch report Technofixes: A Critical Guide to Climate Change Technologies. The Guardian, “Swapping technologies fails to address the root causes of climate change,” July 15, 2009, http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/cif-green/2009/jul/15/technofix-climate-change]
Economic growth itself is not a measure of human well-being, it only measures things with an assessed monetary value. It values wants at the same level as needs and, while it purports to bring prosperity to the masses, its tendency to concentrate profit in fewer and fewer hands leaves billions without the necessities of a decent life.

Techno-fixation masks the incompatibility of solving climate change with unlimited economic growth. Even if energy consumption can be reduced for an activity, ongoing economic growth eats up the improvement and overall energy consumption still rises. We continue destructive consumption in the expectation that new miracle technologies will come and save us.

The hope of a future techno-fix feeds into the pass-it-forward, do-nothing-now culture typified by targets for 2050. Tough targets for 2050 are not tough at all, they are a decoy. Where are the techno-fix plans for the peak in global emissions by 2015 that the IPCC says we need?

Even within the limited sphere of technology, we have to separate the solutions from the primacy of profit. We need to choose what's the most effective, not the most lucrative. Investors will want the maximum return for their money, and so the benefits of any climate technologies will, in all likelihood, be sold as carbon credits to the polluter industries and nations. It would not be done in tandem with emissions cuts but instead of them, making it not a tool of mitigation but of exacerbation.

Climate change is not the only crisis currently facing humanity. Peak oil is likely to become a major issue within the coming decade. Competition for land and water, soil fertility depletion and collapse of fisheries are already posing increasing problems for food supply and survival in many parts of the world.

Technological solutions to climate change fail to address most of these issues. Yet even without climate change, this systemic environmental and social crisis threatens society, and requires deeper solutions than new technology alone can provide. Around a fifth of emissions come from deforestation, more than for all transport emissions combined. There is no technological fix for that. We simply need to consume less of the forest, that is to say, less meat, less agrofuel and less wood.

Our level of consumption is inequitable. Making it universal is simply impossible. The scientist Jared Diamond calculates that if the whole world were to have our level of consumption, it would be the equivalent of having 72 billion people on earth.

With ravenous economic growth still prized as the main objective of society by all political leaders the world over, that 72 billion would be just the beginning. At 3% annual growth, 25 years later it would be the equivalent of 150 billion people. A century later it would be over a trillion. Something's got to give. And indeed, it already is. It's time for us to call it a crisis and respond with the proportionate radical action that is needed.

**We need profound change** – not only government measures and targets but financial systems, the operation of corporations, and people's own expectations of progress and success. Building a new economic democracy based on meeting human needs equitably and sustainably is at least as big a challenge as climate change itself, but if human society is to succeed the two are inseparable.

Instead of asking how to continue to grow the economy while attempting to cut carbon, we should be asking why economic growth is seen as more important than survival.